

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: Hans John HANSEN  
Title: METHODS OF ANTIBODY-DIRECTED  
ENZYM-PRODRUG THERAPY  
Appl. No.: 09/216,609  
Filing Date: December 21, 1998  
Examiner: A. Holleran  
Art Unit: 1642



**RECEIVED**

NOV 22 2000

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**  
**UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.111**

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed August 18, 2000. Please consider the following remarks.

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-54 are pending in the application, but claims 47 and 48 are withdrawn from consideration. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-46 and 49-54. In view of the following remarks, applicant respectfully urges that the rejections be withdrawn.

**35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-50, 53 and 54 as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention. In particular, the Examiner rejects the recitation of "optional" steps "b" and "d" in claims 1 and 53. However, applicant submits that neither 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph nor the MPEP precludes the recitation of "optional" steps in the claims. In this context, the relevant inquiry is whether the claim reasonably apprises those skilled in the art of the utilization and scope of the invention. *Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies*, 231 USPQ 81, 94-95 (1986). Here, it is clear that the claims cover methods for targeting a therapeutic agent to a target site in a patient, whether or not a clearance composition is used. Thus, the